arXiv:1402.1804v1 [math.CA] 8 Feb 2014

SOME OPTIMIZATIONS FOR (MAXIMAL) MULTIPLIERS IN L^p

BEN KRAUSE

Abstract. Using the Multi-Frequency Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of [6], and a discretization suggested in the arguments of [4] we lower estimates of [6] and [4].

We also use these techniques to improve the results of [3].

1. Introduction

In his celebrated paper [1], Bourgain proved the following:

Theorem 1.1 (Lemma 4.11 of [1])**.** *For any collection of N frequencies, $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$\Big\| \sup_j |\left(\hat{f} 1_{R_j}\right)^\vee(x)| \Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \log^2 N \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

where R_j is the 2^{-j} neighborhood of Σ. (We refer the reader to §1.2 for the precise definition of the $\lesssim$ notation)

This beautiful lemma was proven via a robust argument which combined Fourier analysis and a metric entropy approach; it proved a key ingredient in his treatment of pointwise polynomial ergodic theorems. We further remark that this result is essentially sharp [2], since it has been shown that at least a power of $\log^{1/4} N$ is needed on the right-hand side.

In recent years, this result has been generalized in a number of ways. In [5, Theorem 8.7] a weighted (L^2-) version of the above result was used to extend Bourgain's Return Times theorem. In [4, Theorem 1.5], the weighted result was extended to the lower L^p regime, $1 < p \leq 2$ by using elegant time-frequency techniques. The boundary $p = 1$ case remained out of reach, however, until Nazarov, Oberlin and Thiele developed a Multi-Frequency Calderón Zygmund decomposition [6]. There, they further extended the L^2-weighted result of [5] to the variational setting [6, Theorem 1.2], and additionally studied the L^1 endpoint [6, Theorem 5.1].

In this note, we improve the main results of the above papers [4, Theorem 1.5], [6, Theorem 1.2] (see below for the precise statements). We do so by establishing an optimal estimate for some metric entropy calculuations (see Lemma 2.3 for a precise statement) and through more delicate use of the Multi-Frequency Calderón Zygmund decomposition (see §3).

Our main L^2-result (§2) is the following

Date: February 11, 2014.

Proposition 1.2. *Suppose that $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are 1-separated frequencies, and define*

$$\begin{aligned} D_k(f) &:= \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int \hat{f}(\xi) \widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi - \xi_j) e(\xi x) \, d\xi \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} e(\xi_j x) \int \hat{f}(\xi + \xi_j) \widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi) e(\xi x) \, d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviate $e(t) := e^{2\pi i t}$. Then, for $q > 2$,

$$\big\| \mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f) \ | k \geq 1) \big\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \cdot \|f\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})},$$

where the q-variation operator, *$\mathcal{V}^q$, is defined below.*

We define the (non-homogeneous) q-variation of the sequence of functions $\{D_k(f)\}$

$$\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f))(x) := \sup_k |D_k(f)| + \left(\sup_{k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_M} \sum_m |D_{k_m} f - D_{k_{m+1}} f|^q \right)^{1/q} (x),$$

where the supremum is taken over finite increasing sequences; we refer the reader below for a more involved discussion of the q-variation norm.

We also include a simplified – and optimized – proof of [6, Theorem 5.1]; this proof is easily adapted to study the L^1 endpoint treated in [4]. We prove the following

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are not necessarily 1-separated, and define $D_k(f)$ as above. Then, for $q > 2$,*

$$\|\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f))\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sqrt{N} \cdot \log^3 N \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Remark 1.4. *The prefactor $\sqrt{N}$ is sharp, and though suggested in the work of* [6, Theorem 5.1]*, was (narrowly) missed there.*

The techniques used in the proof of the above proposition robust enough to prove useful in studying the behavior of Fourier multipliers with bounded r-variation. We briefly discuss our main result in this direction (see §4 for greater depth):

We define the (non-homogeneous) r-variation norm, the $\mathcal{V}^r$-norm, of a function

$$\|h\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(\mathbb{R})} := \|h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \left(\sup_{\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \cdots < \xi_K} \sum_k |h(\xi_k) - h(\xi_{k+1})|^r \right)^{1/r},$$

where the supremum is over all strictly increasing finite sequences of real numbers.

For X a finite collection of disjoint subintervals of $\mathbb{R}$, and $\{m_\omega : \omega \in X\}$ a collection of functions with $\hat{m}_\omega$ supported in ω, and $\|\hat{m}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{V}^r}$ uniformly bounded in ω, we consider operators of the form

$$\mathcal{M} f := \left(\sum_\omega \hat{m}_\omega \hat{f} \right)^\vee.$$

In [3], it was proven that for any $r \geq 2$, $|\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}| < \frac{1}{r}$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exist absolute constants $C_{q,r,\epsilon}$ so that

$$\|\mathcal{M} f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_{q,r,\epsilon} |X|^{|\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}| + \epsilon} \sup_\omega \|\hat{m}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}.$$

We prove that the ϵ is extraneous:

Theorem 1.5. *There exist absolute constants $C_{r,q}$ so that*

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_{q,r}|X|^{|\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}|} \sup_{\omega} \|\hat{m}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}.$$

We prove this result by studying the L^1-endpoint behavior of simpler multiplier operators (§4). Our approach, however, just fails to shed light on the endpoint question raised in [9]:

Problem 1.6. *For $\|\hat{m}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{V}^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$ uniformly bounded, what is the best $|X|$-dependent bound, $C_1(|X|)$, in the weak-type inequality*

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{1,\infty} \leq C_1(|X|)\|f\|_1?$$

We look forward to addressing this problem in further research.

The structure of the paper is as follows:
Below, we present our improvements to [6] and [4]
In §2, we develop our L^2-theory;
In §3, we turn to the end-point L^1 question; and
In §4, we discuss multipliers with bounded r-variation.

1.1. **Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Christoph Thiele for helpful conversations, and his advisor, Terence Tao, for his support.

1.2. **Notation.** Throughout, we will make use of the exponential notation

$$e(t) := e^{2\pi i t}.$$

For an interval I, we let CI denote the concentric interval dilated by a factor of C:

$$I = (-l + c, c + l) \Rightarrow CI = (-Cl + c, c + Cl).$$

In the first sections, with $q > 2$ fixed, we also shall assume $N = O_q(1)$ is large – say $\log N \frac{q}{q-2} \geq 10$; in what follows, the modifications necessary to lift this assumption are straightforward.

We will also make use of the modified Vinogradov notation. We use $X \lesssim Y$, or $Y \gtrsim X$ to denote the estimate $X \leq CY$ for an absolute constant C. If we need C to depend on a parameter, we shall indicate this by subscripts, thus for instance $X \lesssim_r Y$ denotes the estimate $X \leq C_r Y$ for some C_r depending on r. We use $X \approx Y$ as shorthand for $X \lesssim Y \lesssim X$.

1.3. **Preliminaries.** Begin by fixing a band-limited Schwartz function $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, with $\operatorname{supp} \hat{\phi} \subset [-1/2, 1/2]$, and let $\phi_t(x) := \frac{1}{t}\phi(x/t)$ denote the usual L^1-normalized dilation.

We recall two families of operators which measure the fluctuation of a sequence of vectors:

For a collection of vectors in a Hilbert space $\{c_k\} \subset H$, let $M_\lambda(\{c_k\})$ denote the H-λ-entropy of the $\{c_k\}$, i.e. the fewest number of λ-balls inside of H required to cover the $\{c_k\}$.

We also introduce the homogeneous and non-homogeneous variation operators, respectively defined below:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_H^q(\{c_k\}) := \sup_{M, k_0<k_1<k_2<\cdots<k_M} \left(\sum_m \|c_{k_m} - c_{k_{m-1}}\|_H^q \right)^{1/q},$$

$$\mathcal{V}_H^q(\{c_k\}) := \sup_k \|c_k\|_H + \sup_{M, k_0<k_1<k_2<\cdots<k_M} \left(\sum_m \|c_{k_m} - c_{k_{m-1}}\|_H^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

When $H = \mathbb{C}$, we shall omit the subscript. We note that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\lambda M_\lambda(\{c_k\})^{1/q} \lesssim \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_H^q(\{c_k\}).$$

We will prove the following

Proposition 1.7. *Suppose that $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are 1-separated frequencies, and define*

$$\begin{aligned} D_k(f) &:= \sum_{k=1}^N \int \hat{f}(\xi) \widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi - \xi_j) e(\xi x)\, d\xi \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) \int \hat{f}(\xi + \xi_j) \widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi) e(\xi x)\, d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with $q > 2$,

$$\big\| \mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f)\ \big|k \geq 1) \big\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \cdot \|f\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

By using a Rademacher-Menshov style argument used in [1, Lemma 4.32] or [6, Theorem 4.3], one may lift the frequency-separation hypothesis at the cost of a further logarithm:

Proposition 1.8. *For any frequencies $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\}$ and any dyadic (frequency) interval ω, let ξ_ω denote the smallest frequency $\xi_j \in \Sigma \cap \omega$ which lies in ω, and let*

$$\widehat{\phi_\omega}(\xi) := \hat{\phi}\left(\frac{\xi - \xi_\omega}{|\omega|}\right).$$

In this instance, define

$$D_k(f) := \sum_{|\omega| = 2^{-k}:\ \omega \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset} \int \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{\phi_\omega}(\xi) e(\xi x)\, d\xi.$$

Then, with $q > 2$,

$$\|\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f))\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim (\log N)^3 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \cdot \|f\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

For the sake of clarity we have contented ourselves with the above results; it should be noted, however, that by arguing as in [6, §4.1-4.2], an improvement of [6, Proposition 4.2] can be achieved:

If

$$\Delta_k(f) := \sum_{|\omega| = 2^{-k}:\ \omega \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset} f * m_\omega,$$

where $\{m_\omega\}$ are Schwartz functions with

$$\widehat{m}_\omega \subset \omega,$$

then we have the following

Corollary 1.9. *For any choice of N frequencies, $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists a $t = t(q) > 2$ so that*

$$\|\mathcal{V}^q(\Delta_k(f))\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim (\log N)^3 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \left(D_2' + V^t\right) \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

where $V^t := \sup_j \mathcal{V}^t\left(\sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}} \widehat{m}_\omega(\xi_j)\right)$, and where $D_2' := \sup_{\omega,\xi} |\omega|^2 |\hat{m}_\omega^{(2)}(\xi)|$.

We also consider the L^1-endpoint behavior of the (non-frequency separated) operator $\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f))$, $q > 2$. We prove

Proposition 1.10. *Under the non-frequency separated hypotheses of Proposition 1.8, with $q > 2$*

$$\|\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f))\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sqrt{N} \cdot \log^3 N \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Our proof relies on the Multi-Frequency Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of [6], and indeed is similar to that of [6, Theorem 5.1]. Our modifications were motivated by the outstanding question of [4] concerning the L^1-endpoint behavior of the operator

$$\sup_{k \geq 5} |\Delta_k f|.$$

Indeed, an easy adaptation of our methods yields that for $1 < p \leq 2$

$$\left\| \sup_{k \geq 5} |\Delta_k f| \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim_t N^{1/p - 1/2} \log^2 N \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})},$$

where the implicit constants depend on a certain V^t-quantity in the above notation. This result represents a modest improvement over the current bound of (essentially) $\lesssim_\epsilon N^{1/p-1/2+\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. We refer the reader to [4, Theorem 1.5] for the precise statement.

2. The L^2 Estimate

In this section, we work under the frequency-separated hypothesis. The modifications to pass to the general case can be found in [6, Theorem 4.3].

2.1. **Preliminaries.**

We shall make use of the following variational results which appear in [1, §3].

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 3.30 of [1])**.** *With $\boldsymbol{f} := (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N)$ an N-tuple of functions, define pointwise*

$$M_\lambda(x) := M_\lambda(\boldsymbol{f} * \phi_t(x) | t > 0).$$

Then, with $C_\phi := \|x\phi'(x)\|_1$, and $r > 2$, we have

$$\left\| \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda M_\lambda^{1/r}(x) \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_\phi \frac{1}{r-2} \|\boldsymbol{f}\|_H = C_\phi \frac{1}{r-2} \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 3.33 of [1]). *Maintaining the notation of the previous lemma, with $N > 0$ we have the bound*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \min\left\{ M_\lambda^{1/2}(x), N^{1/2} \right\} \, d\lambda \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim C_\phi (\log N)^2 \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})}.$$

To the best of our knowledge, the following technical result has yet to appear in print.

Lemma 2.3. *With the above notation,*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \min\left\{ M_\lambda(x)^{1/2}, N^{1/2} M_\lambda(x)^{1/q} \right\} \, d\lambda \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \left(\log N \frac{q}{q-2} \right)^2 \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Proof. Let

$$F(x) := K_\phi \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^N |\mathcal{M}(f_j)|^2)^{1/2}$$

denote an appropriate amplification of the vector-valued maximal function, where K_ϕ depends only on the least radially-decreasing majorant of the Schwartz function ϕ.

Set

$$\theta := \frac{1}{\log N}, \; a := \frac{q-2}{2q}\,\theta, \; C := N^{\frac{\theta}{2a}} = N^{\frac{q}{q-2}},$$

and majorize

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \min\left\{ M_\lambda(x)^{1/2}, N^{1/2} M_\lambda(x)^{1/q} \right\} \, d\lambda & \\ \leq N^{\theta/2} \int_0^{F(x)/C} \lambda^{1-a} M_\lambda(x)^{\frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{q}} \, \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^{1-a}} + N^{\theta/2} \int_{F(x)/C}^{F(x)} \lambda M_\lambda(x)^{\frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{q}} \, \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} & \\ =: I_1(x) + I_2(x). & \end{aligned}$$

We begin with $I_1(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x) &\leq N^{\theta/2} \cdot \left(\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{1-a} M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}} \right) \cdot \int_0^{F(x)/C} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^{1-a}} \\ &\leq N^{\theta/2} \cdot \left(\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{1-a} M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{a} \, (F(x)/C)^a \\ &= \frac{1}{a} \left(\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{1-a} M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}} \right) \cdot (F(x))^a \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a} \left(\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q(1-a)}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}} \right) + F(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Young's inequality with exponents $(\frac{1}{a}, \frac{1}{1-a})$ in the final line. With

$$\begin{aligned} t &:= \frac{2q(1-a)}{q-q\theta+2\theta} = \frac{2q\log N - (q-2)}{q\log N - (q-2)} > 2, \\ \frac{1}{t-2} &= \frac{q-q\theta+2\theta}{2q\theta - 2qa - 4\theta} = \frac{q\log N - (q-2)}{2(q-2-\frac{q-2}{2})} \leq \log N \frac{q}{q-2} \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 2.1 in mind, we take L^2_x-norms and estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|I_1\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{a}\left(\log N\frac{q}{q-2}\right)\left(\sum_j \|f_j\|^2_{L^2_x}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{a}\left(\sum_j \|f_j\|^2_{L^2_x}\right)^{1/2}\\ &\lesssim \left(\log N\frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \left\|\left(\sum_j |f_j|^2\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{L^2_x}.\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the similar, but slightly simpler, second component:

$$\begin{aligned}I_2(x) &\leq N^{\theta/2}\left(\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}}\right)\log C\\ &\lesssim \frac{\theta}{2a}\log N\left(\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}}\right)\\ &= \frac{q}{q-2}\log N\left(\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda M_\lambda(x)^{\left(\frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta}\right)^{-1}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The argument is concluded as above, this time with

$$\begin{aligned}t &:= \frac{2q}{q-q\theta+2\theta} = \frac{2q\log N}{\log N-(q-2)} > 2,\\ \frac{1}{t-2} &= \frac{q-q\theta+2\theta}{2q\theta-4\theta} = \frac{q\log N-(q-2)}{2(q-2)} \leq \log N\frac{q}{q-2};\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\|I_2\|_2 \lesssim \left(\log N\frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \left\|\left(\sum_j |f_j|^2\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{L^2_x}.$$

□

The previous lemma will be used in conjunction with the lemma below to yield Proposition 1.7.

Lemma 2.4. *For a sequence*

$$\{c_k(1),\dots,c_k(N)\}_{k\geq 1}\subset\mathbb{R}^N,$$

let $M_\lambda = M_\lambda(\{c_k\})$ denote the $l^2([N])$-entropy of the collection, where $l^2([N])$ is the usual N-dimensional Hilbert space. Suppose that $\{\xi_1,\dots,\xi_N\}$ are 1-separated frequencies.

Then, for $q>2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathcal{V}^q\left(\sum_{j=1}^N c_k(j)e(\xi_j y)\ |k\geq 1\right)\right\|_{L^2_y[0,1]}\\ &\qquad\lesssim \int_0^\infty \min\left\{M_\lambda^{1/2}, N^{1/2}M_\lambda^{1/q}\right\}\,d\lambda + \int_0^\infty \min\left\{M_\lambda^{1/2}, N^{1/2}\right\}\,d\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first term on the right hand side is from the homogeneous q-variation, which comes from the proof of [6, Lemma 3.2]. For the second term, which extends the result to non-homogeneous q-variation, see the proof of [5, Lemma 8.4]. □

We are now ready for the proof of our L^2 result.

2.2. **The Proof.**

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose that $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\}$ are 1-separated frequencies, and define*

$$\begin{aligned} D_k(f) &:= \sum_{k=1}^N \int \hat{f}(\xi)\widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi - \xi_j) e(\xi x)\, d\xi \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) \int \hat{f}(\xi + \xi_j)\widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi) e(\xi x)\, d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\big\| \mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f)\ \big| k \geq 1) \big\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right) \cdot \|f\|_{L^2_x(\mathbb{R})}.$$

This proposition, and its proof, are very similar to [6, Proposition 4.1], which is in turn is inspired by [1, Lemma 4.11]. The only novelty is the use of Lemma 2.3.

Proof. Define, via the Fourier transform,

$$\hat{f}_j(\xi) := \hat{f}(\xi + \xi_j)\psi(\xi),$$

where $1_{[-1/4,1/4]} \leq \hat{\psi} \leq 1_{[-1/2,1/2]}$ (say), and note that by the separation of the $\{\xi_j\}$ and Plancherel,

$$\Big\| \Big(\sum |f_j|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big\|_{L^2_x} \leq \|f\|_2.$$

With this notation in hand, we may express

$$D_k(f) = \sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) \int \widehat{f_j}(\xi)\widehat{\phi_{2^k}}(\xi) e(\xi x)\, d\xi = \sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) f_j * \phi_{2^k}(x);$$

it is therefore enough to prove the vector-valued estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathcal{V}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) f_j * \phi_{2^k}\ \big| k \geq 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_x} \\ &\qquad \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \cdot \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x}. \end{aligned}$$

[1, Lemma 4.13] allows us to reduce the matter to the homogeneous case:

$$(*) \quad \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) f_j * \phi_{2^k}\ \big| k \geq 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_x} \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2 \cdot \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x},$$

where without loss of generality each f_j has frequency support inside $[-1/2, 1/2]$; we use Bourgain's averaging argument to do so.

Let B denote the best a priori constant satisfying $(*)$, which we know is finite – and indeed $\lesssim \sqrt{N}$ by Fefferman-Stein's vector-valued Hardy-Littlewood maximal inequality [8, §2.1]. The job is to prove

$$B \lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{q}{q-2}\right)^2.$$

With $T_y(g)(x) := g(x+y)$, we majorize, for $0 \le y < \frac{1}{100}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x) f_j * \phi_{2^k} \ \big| k \ge 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_x} \\
&\quad \le \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x)(T_y f_j) * \phi_{2^k} \ \big| k \ge 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_x} + \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j x)(f_j - T_y f_j) * \phi_{2^k} \ \big| k \ge 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_x} \\
&\quad =: S_1(y) + B \left\| \left(\sum_j |(f_j - T_y f_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x} \\
&\quad < S_1(y) + \frac{B}{2} \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the band-limited nature of the $\{f_j\}$ in the last inequality.

Averaging this inequality over $0 \le y < \frac{1}{100}$, we see that we just need to prove

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_0^{\frac{1}{100}} |S_1(y)|^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2} &\le \left\| \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j y) \cdot (e(\xi_j x)(f_j) * \phi_{2^k}(x)) \ \big| k \ge 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_y[0,1]} \right\|_{L^2_x} \\
&\lesssim (\log N)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{q}{q-2} \right)^2 \cdot \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2_x}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we apply Lemma 2.4 to the inner integral, we get the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^q \left(\sum_{k=1}^N e(\xi_j y) \cdot (e(\xi_j x)(f_j) * \phi_{2^k}(x)) \ \big| k \ge 1 \right) \right\|_{L^2_y[0,1]} \\
&\quad \le \int_0^\infty \min\{ M_\lambda^{1/2}(x), N^{1/2} M_\lambda^{1/q}(x) \} \, d\lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_\lambda(x)$ is the (pointwise) $l^2[N]$-λ-entropy of

$$\big(e(\xi_1 x)(f_1) * \phi_{2^k}(x), e(\xi_2 x)(f_2) * \phi_{2^k}(x), \dots, e(\xi_N x)(f_N) * \phi_{2^k}(x) \big)_{k \ge 1}.$$

Taking L^2_x-norms and using Lemma 2.3 now yields the result. □

3. The Weak-Type $(1-1)$ Estimate

As announced, in this section we prove Proposition 1.10, restated below for the reader's convenience:

Proposition 3.1. *With* $D_k(f) := \sum_{|\omega| = 2^{-k} : \omega \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset} \int \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{\phi_\omega}(\xi) e(\xi x) \, d\xi$,

$$\| \mathcal{V}^q(D_k(f)) \|_{L^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \sqrt{N} \cdot \log^3 N \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q}{q-2} \right)^2 \| f \|_{L^1}.$$

Before turning to the proof proper, we briefly recall the multi-frequency Calderón-Zygmund Decomposition:

3.1. **The Multi-Frequency Calderón-Zygmund.**

Theorem 3.2 ([6], Theorem 1.1)**.** *For any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $\lambda > 0$, there exists a decomposition*

$$f = g + b = g + \sum_J b_J$$

for a disjoint collection of (dyadic) intervals $\{J\}$ according to the following properties:

(1) $\|f_J\|_1 := \|f 1_J\|_1 \lesssim \frac{\lambda|J|}{\sqrt{N}}$;
(2) $\|g_J\|_2 := \|f_J - b_J\|_2 \lesssim |J|^{1/2}\lambda$;
(3) $\|g\|_2^2 \lesssim \sqrt{N}\lambda\|f\|_1$;
(4) $\operatorname{supp} b_J \subset 3J$, $\sum_J |J| \lesssim \sqrt{N}\frac{\|f\|_1}{\lambda}$;
(5) $\|b_J\|_1 \lesssim \lambda|J|$; *and*
(6) *b is orthogonal to the frequencies: $\int b_J(x)e(-\xi_j x) = 0$ for each J, n.*

It will be convenient to discretize our operator. We do so as follows:

3.2. **A Discretization.** With ϕ_ω as above, let $\eta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ be a positive mean-one mollifier with $\operatorname{supp}\eta \subset [-0.1, 0.1]$ (say), and let A be a Schwartz function with

$$1_{[-1.4,1.4]} \leq \hat{A}(\xi) \leq 1_{[-1.6,1.6]}.$$

With $B := \eta^\vee$, we use windowed Fourier series as in [4, §6] to express

$$\widehat{f\phi_\omega}(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\omega|}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\int \hat{f}(t)\widehat{\phi_\omega}(t)e(\frac{l}{|\omega|}t)\ dt \right) e(-\frac{l}{|\omega|}\xi)\widehat{(AB)}\left(\frac{\xi-\xi_\omega}{|\omega|}\right).$$

Set

$$\phi_{l,\omega}(z) := e(-z\xi_\omega)\frac{1}{|I|}\tilde{\phi}\left(\frac{z-l|I|}{|I|}\right)$$

where $\tilde{g}(z) := g(-z)$ denotes reflection about the origin, and $|I| = |\omega|^{-1}$; we note that in the special case $l = 0$, we have

$$\phi_{l,\omega}(z) = e(-z\xi_\omega)\tilde{\phi}_{|I|}(z).$$

After an argument with the Fourier transform, we have

$$f * \phi_\omega(x) = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x)\cdot(AB)\left(\frac{x-l|I|}{|I|}\right) =: \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x)\cdot T_{l,|I|}\big(AB\big)(x).$$

Consequently, with $2^k = |I| = |\omega|^{-1}$, we may express

$$D_k(f) := \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} \langle f, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) \right) T_{l,|I|}\big(AB\big)(x),$$

as a sum of projections.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. By homogeneity, it suffices to prove the weak-type estimate at height $\lambda = 1$. We therefore apply the Multi-Frequency Calderón-Zygmund decomposition 3.2 at height 1. By standard arguments, it suffices to show that for each J selected

$$\|\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(b_J))\|_{L^1((J^*)^c)} \lesssim |J|,$$

where $J^* := 100J$. By scale and translation invariance, we may assume $J = [0,1)$; we proceed to majorize

$$\mathcal{V}^q(D_k(b_J)) \leq \sum_{k\geq 0} |D_k(b_J)| + \sum_{k<0} |D_k(b_J)|,$$

according to scale, and estimate each term separately in $\| - \|_{L^1((J^*)^c)}$.

We begin with the more demanding

Case 1: $k \geq 0$. We use our discretization to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{k\geq 0} |D_k(b_J)| \right\|_{L^1} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{|I|=2^k, k\geq 0} \left\| \left(\sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} A \right) \cdot \big(T_{l,|I|} B\big) \right\|_{L^1} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{|I|=2^k, k\geq 0} \|T_{l,|I|} B\|_{L^2} \left\| \sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} A \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \lesssim \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{|I|=2^k, k\geq 0} |I|^{1/2} \left\| \sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} A(x) \right\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now split our sum

$$\sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} := \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{\omega,i} := \sum_{i=1}^{10} \left(\sum_{\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset,\ \omega=2^{-k}[m,m+1),\ m\equiv i \mod 10} \right),$$

so that we may bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{|\omega|=2^{-k}:\omega\cap\Sigma\neq\emptyset} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} A(x) \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{10} \left\| \sum_{\omega,i} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} A(x) \right\|_{L^2} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{10} \left\| \left(\sum_{\omega,i} |\langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle|^2 |T_{l,|I|} A|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

taking into account the band-limited nature of our function A. Our bounds will be uniform in $1 \leq i \leq 10$, so we suppress i-dependence throughout.

We begin with the top term, $l = 0$, and suppress l-dependence as well; we will show that for each $|I|$,

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{\omega} |\langle b_J, \phi_\omega\rangle|^2 |T_{|I|} A|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{3/4}},$$

since a sum over $|I| \geq 1$ will yield the $l = 0$ bound

$$\sum_{k\geq 0} \left\| \sum_{\omega} \langle b_J, \phi_{l,\omega}\rangle e(\xi_\omega x) T_{l,|I|} \big(AB\big) \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1.$$

Regarding our scale $|I| = 2^k$ as fixed, we abbreviate

$$\rho(z) := \tilde{\phi}_{|I|}(z) - \tilde{\phi}_{|I|}(0) = \frac{1}{|I|}\tilde{\phi}(\frac{z}{|I|}) - \frac{1}{|I|}\tilde{\phi}(0),$$

and use the orthogonality of the $\{b_J\}$ to our frequencies $\{e(-z\xi_\omega)\}$ to re-express the integrand as

$$\left(\sum_\omega |\langle b_J, \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\rangle|^2 |T_{|I|}A|^2(x)\right)^{1/2};$$

we remark the mean-value theorem yields the bound

$$(*_0) \quad |\rho(z)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^2}$$

pointwise near $3J$, with implicit constant depending on $\|\phi'\|_{L^\infty}$.

Now, using the triangle inequality, it suffices to estimate the L^2 norm of each of the following functions separately:

$$F(x) := \left(\sum_\omega |\langle f_J, \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\rangle|^2 |T_{|I|}A|^2(x)\right)^{1/2}$$
$$G(x) := \left(\sum_\omega |\langle g_J, \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\rangle|^2 |T_{|I|}A|^2(x)\right)^{1/2}.$$

F is easy, since we have the pointwise bound

$$F(x) \leq \left(\sum_\omega \left(\|f_J\|_1 \cdot \frac{1}{|I|^2}\right)^2\right)^{1/2} |T_{|I|}A|(x) \leq \sqrt{N}\|f_J\|_1 \frac{1}{|I|^2}|T_{|I|}A|(x).$$

Consequently,

$$\|F\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sqrt{N}\|f_J\|_1 \frac{1}{|I|^2}|I|^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{3/2}}.$$

We use duality to handle $\|G\|_{L^2}$. Specifically, for an appropriate $\sum \|\psi_\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 1$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G\|_2 &\lesssim \left|\int \sum_\omega \langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle \cdot \langle g_J, \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\rangle\right| \\
&= \left|\langle g_J, \sum_\omega \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega) \cdot \langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle\rangle\right| \\
&\lesssim \left\|\sum_\omega \rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega) \cdot \langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle\right\|_{L^2(3J)} \\
&\leq \left\|\sum_\omega \chi(z)\rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega) \cdot \langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},
\end{aligned}$$

where $1_{[-4,4]} \leq \chi \leq 1_{[-5,5]}$ (say) is a smooth bump function, and we have made use of the normalization $\|g_J\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1$, along with the support condition $\operatorname{supp} g_J \subset 3J$.

We will bound the above expression by the square root of

$$\sum_{\omega} \|\rho(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\chi\|_{L^2}^2 \cdot |\langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle|^2 + \sum_{\omega\neq\omega'} |\langle \psi_\omega, T_{|I|}A\rangle| K(\omega,\omega') |\langle \psi_{\omega'}, T_{|I|}A\rangle|$$

$$\lesssim |I| \left(\sum_{\omega} \|\rho(z)\chi(z)e(-z\xi_\omega)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\psi_\omega\|_2^2 + \sum_{\omega\neq\omega'} \|\psi_\omega\|_{L^2} K(\omega,\omega') \|\psi_{\omega'}\|_{L^2} \right)$$

$$=: |I| \left(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{O}\right),$$

where

$$K(\omega,\omega') := \left| \int |\rho(z)\chi(z)|^2 e((\xi_{\omega'} - \xi_\omega)z)\, dz \right|.$$

Using $(*)$, the diagonal estimate is straightforward:

$$\mathcal{D} \leq \max_{\omega} \|\rho(z)\chi(z)e(-\xi_\omega z)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^4}.$$

We will use the bound

$$K(\omega,\omega') \lesssim \min\left\{ \frac{1}{|\xi_\omega - \xi_{\omega'}|}, \frac{1}{|\xi_\omega - \xi_{\omega'}|^2} \right\} \frac{1}{|I|^4} \leq \frac{1}{|\xi_\omega - \xi_{\omega'}|^{3/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{|I|^4}$$

to control the off-diagonal term. We obtain this estimate by integrating by parts once and twice, and by using that on $\operatorname{supp}\chi$ we have the bounds

$$|\rho| + |\rho'| \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^2},\ |\rho''| \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^3}.$$

Using the fact that for $\omega \neq \omega'$

$$|\xi_\omega - \xi_{\omega'}| > |\omega| = |I|^{-1},$$

we may bound, for each ω,

$$\sum_{\omega'\neq\omega} K(\omega,\omega') \leq \frac{1}{|I|^4} \sum_{\omega'\neq\omega} \frac{1}{|\xi_\omega - \xi_{\omega'}|^{3/2}} \lesssim \frac{|I|^{3/2}}{|I|^4} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{5/2}}.$$

With this in hand, Young's inequality leads to the bound

$$\mathcal{O} \lesssim \sum_{\omega\neq\omega'} \|\psi_\omega\|_{L^2}^2 |K(\omega,\omega')| \lesssim \sum_{\omega} \|\psi_\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{1}{|I|^{5/2}} \leq \frac{1}{|I|^{5/2}},$$

Putting things together, we have obtained the estimate

$$|I|\left(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{O}\right) \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{3/2}};$$

taking a square-root leads to the bound

$$\|G\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{3/4}}.$$

Combining all our estimates, we may bound

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{\omega} |\langle b_J, \phi_\omega\rangle|^2 |T_{l,|I|}A|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2} \leq \|F\|_{L^2} + \|G\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^{3/4}},$$

which concludes the $l = 0$ case.

The remaining terms $l \neq 0$ are handled similarly, using the analogous mean-value estimate on J

$$(*_{|l|}) \quad \left| \frac{1}{|I|} \tilde{\phi} \left(\frac{z - l|I|}{|I|} \right) - \frac{1}{|I|} \tilde{\phi} \left(\frac{-l|I|}{|I|} \right) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|^2} |l|^{-2},$$

and similarly

$$|\partial_z^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \tilde{\phi} \left(\frac{z - l|I|}{|I|} \right) \right)| \lesssim_\phi \frac{l^{-2}}{|I|^{1+\alpha}}, \ \alpha = 1, 2,$$

where the implicit constants depend further on the decay of ϕ', ϕ''.

This concludes the first case, $|I| \geq |J| = 1$. □

We next turn to

Case 2: $k < 0$. With $J = [0, 1)$ as above, and regarding the scale $|I| = 2^k$ as fixed, we use the decay of the functions ϕ_ω to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{|\omega| = 2^{-k} : \omega \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset} \phi_\omega * b_J \right\|_{L^1((J^*)^c)} &\leq N \max_\omega \|\phi_\omega * b_J\|_{L^1((J^*)^c)} \\ &\leq N \|b_J\|_1 \left\| \sup_{y \in 3J} |\phi_\omega(z - y)| \right\|_{L^1((J^*)^c)} \\ &\lesssim N |I|^{M-1} (e)^{1-M}, \end{aligned}$$

where we may take

$$M = M(N) = \log N,$$

and the implicit constant depends on the best bound, D_M, satisfying $|\phi(z)| \leq D_M |z|^{-M}$ as $|z| \to \infty$. Summing over $|I|$ concludes the proof. □

□

Remark 3.3. *As mentioned above, this argument is easily adapted to handle the (simpler) operator*

$$Vf(x) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{V}_{k \geq 5}^r (1_I(x) \langle f, \phi_{I,n} \rangle)^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

of [4, §5]. *Indeed, one can similarly prove that*

$$\|Vf\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \sqrt{N} \|f\|_1,$$

with implicit constants depending on various (scalar) variational quantities discussed in [4].

Remark 3.4. *This proof further generalizes to the case of multiple weights, i.e. the* $\{D_k\}$ *are replaced with* $\{\Delta_k\}$ *of* [6].

4. Multipliers with Bounded r-Variation

This section will be devoted to Theorem 1.5.

We will use the following decomposition lemma [3]:

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $1 \leq r < \infty$, and $\|g\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(\mathbb{R})} < \infty$. Then there exist collections of intervals $\mathcal{I}_j$ so that we may decompose*

$$g = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_j} d_I 1_I,$$

where $|\mathcal{I}_j| \leq 2^j$, $|d_I| \leq 2^{-j/r} \|g\|_{\mathcal{V}^r(\mathbb{R})}$ for each $I \in \mathcal{I}_j$, and the intervals $I \in \mathcal{I}_j$ are pairwise disjoint.

Using this lemma, it is enough to establish the following:

Proposition 4.2.

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{\omega \in X} d_\omega 1_\omega \hat{f} \right)^\vee \right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sup |d_\omega| |X|^{|\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}|} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})};$$

by duality, it is enough to consider the $1 < q \leq 2$ case. We will establish the weak-type estimate

Proposition 4.3.

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{\omega \in X} d_\omega 1_\omega \hat{f} \right)^\vee \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sup |d_\omega| |X|^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}.$$

So, viewing $\{\omega\}$ and $\{d_\omega\}$ as fixed, without loss of generality $|d_\omega| \leq 1$, we let

$$Tf = T_{\{\omega\}, \{d_\omega\}} := \left(\sum_{\omega \in X} d_\omega 1_\omega \hat{f} \right)^\vee$$

denote the relevant operator.

The proof of Proposition 4.3 will follow along similarly to that of Proposition 1.10; technical complications arise from the fact that our multipliers are given by (rough) indicator functions, rather than by (smooth) Schwartz weights.

We therefore begin with a smooth decomposition of each 1_ω.

Let $\{u(\omega)\}$ be (dyadic) Whitney intervals so that for each ω

- $100u(\omega) \subset \omega$;
- $\bigcup u(\omega) = \omega$ is an almost disjoint union;
- there exists an absolute $K = O(1)$ so that $\sum_{u(\omega)} 1_{20u(\omega)} \leq K$, i.e. the collection $\{20u(\omega)\}$ has bounded overlap.

Associated to this decomposition, we define two families of smooth functions,

$$\{\phi_{u(\omega)}\} \text{ and } \{A_{u(\omega)}\}.$$

The $\{\phi_{u(\omega)}\}$ satisfy

$$1_\omega = \sum_{u(\omega)} \widehat{\phi}_{u(\omega)}, \quad \text{and } \operatorname{supp} \widehat{\phi}_{u(\omega)} = I(u(\omega)),$$

where $I(u(\omega))$ is an interval concentric with $u(\omega)$ of without loss of generality dyadic length and $2 < \frac{|I(u(\omega))|}{|u(\omega)|} \leq 4$. By our Whitney decomposition, we may assume that there exists an absolute $R = O(1)$ so that for each ω and each j,

$$\#\{u(\omega) : I(u(\omega)) = 2^{-j}\} \leq R.$$

We similarly define $\widehat{A}_{u(\omega)}$ to be smooth functions supported in $15u(\omega)$ and identically equal to one on $10u(\omega)$.

We shall require uniform decay on $\{\phi_{u(\omega)}\}$ and $\{A_{u(\omega)}\}$: if $I(u(\omega)) = 2^{-j}$, then we demand that

$$\left\|\widehat{\phi}^{(M)}_{u(\omega)}\right\|_\infty + \left\|\widehat{A}^{(M)}_{u(\omega)}\right\|_\infty \leq C_M 2^{Mj}$$

for $M = \log_2 N$.

Finally, we consider a family of smooth, positive, mean-one mollifiers,

$$\int \eta_j = 1, \ \operatorname{supp} \eta \subset \left\{\xi : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{1000} 2^{-j}\right\},$$

so that for $|I(u(\omega))| = 2^{-j}$,

$$\eta_j * \hat{A}_{u(\omega)} = 1$$

on $5I(u(\omega))$ (say).

Next, if c_ω denotes the center of each interval ω, we define rescaled, shifted-to-the-origin versions of our multipliers $\left\{\phi_{u(\omega)}, A_{u(\omega)}\right\}$:

For $|I(u(\omega))| = 2^{-j}$, we define

$$\hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)*}(2^j(\xi - c_\omega)) := \hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)}(\xi) \text{ i.e. } \hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)*}(\xi) := \hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)}(\frac{\xi}{2^j} + c_\omega),$$

and similarly for $A_{u(\omega)*}$.

Collect

$$\mathcal{F}_j := \left\{u(\omega) : |I(u(\omega))| = 2^{-j}\right\}$$

and sparsify

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^{RK} \mathcal{F}_j^k$$

into RK families, so that

- Each $\mathcal{F}_j^k$ has at most one $u(\omega)$ with $|I(u(\omega))| = 2^{-j}$ from each ω (i.e. if $u(\omega), u'(\omega') \in \mathcal{F}_j^k$ with $|I(u(\omega))| = |I(u'(\omega'))|$, then necessarily $\omega \neq \omega'$;
- For each $u(\omega) \in \mathcal{F}_j^k$, the supports of each $\hat{A}_{u(\omega)}$ are disjoint.

Since our estimates will be uniform in k, in what follows, we shall suppress all dependence of k in our $\mathcal{F}_j^k$.

With this in mind, we decompose

$$\widehat{Tf} := \sum_j \widehat{T_j f} := \sum_j \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} d_{u(\omega)} \hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)} \hat{f} \right),$$

where we denote $d_{u(\omega)} = d_\omega$ for $u(\omega) \subset \omega$.

Following along the lines of the previous section we discretize each T_j:

With $|I(u(\omega))| = 2^{-j}$ we used windowed Fourier series to express

$$\hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)}(\xi)\hat{f}(\xi) = 2^j \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int \hat{f}(t) \hat{\phi}_{u(\omega)}(t) e(2^j l t) \, dt \right) e(-2^j l \xi) \hat{A}_{u(\omega)} * \eta_j(\xi).$$

After an argument with the Fourier transform, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{u(\omega)}\phi_{u(\omega)} * f(x) \\ & \quad = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f(x), e(-c_\omega x)2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\rangle \cdot \big(e(c_\omega x)A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\big)\left(d_{u(\omega)}\cdot \eta_j^\vee(x-2^j l)\right) \\ & \quad =: \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f(x), e(-c_\omega x)2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\rangle \cdot \big(E_{u(\omega),j,l}(x)\big)\left(d_{u(\omega)}\cdot \eta_j^\vee(x-2^j l)\right); \end{aligned}$$

for convenience, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E_{u(\omega),j,l}}(\xi) &:= \big(e(c_\omega x)\widehat{A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)}\big)(\xi) \\ &= e(-\xi 2^j l)e(c_w 2^j l)\hat{A}_{u(\omega)}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply the Multi-Frequency Calderón-Zygmund decomposition at height $\lambda = 1$, and extract $b = \sum_J b_J$ orthogonal to $\{e(-c_\omega x) : \omega \in X\}$. By standard arguments, and scale and translation invariance, our task is once again to show that

$$\|Tb_J\|_{L^1(\{|x|\geq 100\})} \lesssim 1$$

where we may assume that $J = [0,1)$.

We will majorize

$$\|Tb_J\|_{L^1(\{|x|\geq 100\})} \leq \sum_j \|T_j b_J\|_{L^1(|x|\geq 100)}$$

according to scale and estimate each term separately.

We turn to

4.1. **The Proof of Theorem 1.5.** As mentioned, the strategy here is very similar to that of Proposition 1.10.

We begin with the more involved case, $j \geq 0$

The Proof, $j \geq 0$. We further decompose

$$\begin{aligned} T_j b_J &:= \sum_l T_{j,l} b_J \\ &:= \sum_l \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x)2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\rangle \cdot \big(e(c_\omega x)A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\big)\right) \cdot \big(d_{u(\omega)}\eta_j(x-2^j l)\big) \\ &= \sum_l \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x)2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x-l)\rangle \cdot E_{u(\omega),j,l}(x)\right) \cdot \big(d_{u(\omega)}\eta_j(x-2^j l)\big); \end{aligned}$$

we will estimate each $\|T_{j,l}b_J\|_1$, and sum over (j,l); by the arguing as above, and using the *uniform* decay of the $\{\phi_{u(\omega)*}\}$, it will be enough to estimate the top $l = 0$ term. We will therefore suppress l-dependence in what follows.

We begin by applying Cauchy-Schwarz to estimate

$$\|T_j b_J\|_1 \lesssim 2^{j/2} \left\| \sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x)2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)\rangle E_{u(\omega),j}(x)\right\|_2,$$

then use the orthogonality of

$$\big\{E_{u(\omega),j}(x)\big\}$$

(see above) to express

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\| \sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) 2^{-j} \phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)\rangle E_{u(\omega),j}(x) \Big\|_2 \\
&\quad = \left\| \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} |\langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) 2^{-j} \phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)\rangle|^2 |E_{u(\omega),j}(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_2 \\
&\quad = \left\| \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} |\langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) 2^{-j} \phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)\rangle|^2 |A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Since b_J is orthogonal to each $e(c_\omega x)$, we may replace the inner products

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) 2^{-j} \phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)\rangle &\equiv \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) \left(2^{-j} \phi_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x) - 2^{-j}\phi_{u(\omega)*}(0) \right)\rangle \\
&=: \langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) \rho_{u(\omega),j}(x)\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that for $|x| \leq 5$ (say) we have the $\rho_{u(\omega),j}$-*uniform* bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
|\rho_{u(\omega),j}| + |\rho'_{u(\omega),j}| &\lesssim 2^{-2j} \\
|\rho''_{u(\omega),j}| &\lesssim 2^{-3j},
\end{aligned}$$

the first point following by the mean-value theorem.

We now majorize

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} |\langle b_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) \rho_{u(\omega),j}(x)\rangle|^2 |A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \leq \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} |\langle f_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) \rho_{u(\omega),j}(x)\rangle|^2 |A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad + \left(\sum_{\mathcal{F}_j} |\langle g_J(x), e(-c_\omega x) \rho_{u(\omega),j,l}(x)\rangle|^2 |A_{u(\omega)*}(2^{-j}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad =: F(x) + G(x),
\end{aligned}$$

and estimate each function separately in L^2.

Using our uniformity conditions on the $\{\rho_{u(\omega),j}\}, \{A_{u(\omega)}\}$, we now find ourselves in the situation of Proposition 1.10, and we may argue as above to conclude

- $\|F\|_2 \lesssim 2^{-3j/2}$; and
- $\|G\|_2 \lesssim 2^{-3j/4}$.

Consequently, we have achieved the upper bound on

$$\|T_j b_J\|_1 \lesssim 2^{j/2} \cdot 2^{-3j/4} \lesssim 2^{-j/4}.$$

We may similarly deduce

$$\|T_{j,l} b_J\|_1 \lesssim 2^{-j/4} \cdot (|l|+1)^{-2};$$

since this is summable over $l \in \mathbb{Z}, j \geq 0$, we have completed this part of the proof. $\square$

We next turn to the simpler $j < 0$ case, where we rely solely on the decay of our functions.

The Proof, $j < 0$. Using our (uniform) decay estimates on $\phi_{u(\omega)}$, we simply estimate, with $M = \log_2 N$

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_j b_J\|_{L^1((100J)^*)} &\leq N \max_{u(\omega)\in\mathcal{F}_j} \left\|\phi_{u(\omega)} * b_J\right\|_{L^1((100J)^c)} \\ &\lesssim N\|b_J\|_1 \left\| 2^{-j} \min\left\{1, \left(\frac{2^j}{|x|}\right)^M\right\}\right\|_{L^1(|x|\geq 50)} \\ &\lesssim N(2^j)^{M-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Summing the foregoing in j yields an upper estimate of

$$N2^{1-M} \lesssim 1$$

for $M = \log_2 N$. □

Remark 4.4. *An interesting question, raised in* [7]*, concerns the L^p-behavior of Bourgain's* maximal *(rough) singular integral* §1*:*

Problem 4.5. *For any collection of N frequencies, $\Sigma := \{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, consider the maximal operator*

$$\mathcal{M}^* f := \sup_j |\left(\hat{f} 1_{R_j}\right)^\vee|(x),$$

where R_j is the 2^{-j} neighborhood of Σ. For $p \neq 2$, what are the best N-dependent constants, $C_p(N)$, so that

$$\|\mathcal{M}^* f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_p(N)\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}?$$

Although the operator $\mathcal{M}^* f$ is too rough to be handled by present technique, we look forward to pursuing this line of inquiry in future work.

References

[1] Bourgain, J. Pointwise ergodic theorems for arithmetic sets. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (69):5-45, 1989.

[2] Bourgain, J.; Kostyukovsky, S.; Olevskii, A. A remark on a maximal operator for Fourier multipliers. Real Anal. Exchange 26 (2000/01), no. 2, 901-904.

[3] Coifman, R; Rubio de Francia, J.L.; Semmes; S. Multiplicateurs de Fourier de $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ et estimations quadratiques, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math. 306 (1988), no. 8, 351-354.

[4] Demeter, C. On some maximal multipliers in Lp. Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 26 (2010), no. 3, 947-964.

[5] Demeter, C.; Lacey, M.; Tao, T.; Thiele, C. Breaking the duality in the return times theorem. Duke Math. J. 143 (2008), no. 2, 281-355.

[6] Nazarov, F.; Oberlin, R.; Thiele, C. A Calderón-Zygmund decomposition for multiple frequencies and an application to an extension of a lemma of Bourgain. Math. Res. Lett. 17 (2010), no. 3, 529-545.

[7] Oberlin, R. Estimates for Compositions of Maximal Operators with Singular Integrals. Canad. Math. Bull. 56 (2013), no. 4, 801-813.

[8] E. M. Stein. Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals. Princeton Mathematical Series, 43. Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[9] Tao, T.; Wright, J. Endpoint multiplier theorems of Marcinkiewicz type. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 17 (2001), no. 3, 521558.

UCLA Math Sciences Building, Los Angeles,CA 90095-1555

E-mail address: benkrause23@math.ucla.edu